

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,344	12/17/2001	Hirokazu Miwa	0941.66061	7994
7590 08/04/2004			EXAMINER	
Patrick G. Burns, Esq. GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500 300 South Wacker Dr.			LAO, LUN YI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2673	
Chicago, IL 6	50606		DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/023,344	MIWA ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Lao Y Lun	2673			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: ('condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	al (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in			
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  136(a) and the appropriate extension fee	ər		
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	d statutory period for reply originally set in on the safter the mailing date of the final rejection.	the final Office action; or (2) as set for the action, even if timely filed, may reduce any	ın		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be					
<ul><li>(a)</li></ul>					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	•		he		
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendme	nt		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	$\operatorname{t(s)}$ $\operatorname{a)}$ will not be entered or $\operatorname{t}$	o)□ will be entered and an ow or appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows					
Claim(s) allowed: None.					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					
		Lun-Yi Lao Primary Examiner Lu J. Lu			

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new limitation of "so as to increase the driving capability" added in claims 1 and 5 raises new issue...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Karube et al teach each data signal line is simultaneously driven by a plurality of driving devices(101-104, SV1-SV8, 113-116)(see figures 1-2 and column 4, lines 31-50); Murade et al teach data signal line(35) is simultaneously driven by a plurality of driving devices(111, 304, 301) and those driving devices(111, 304, 301) are for controlling each data line(35)(see figure 2) and Zhang et al teach each data signal line(source or drain line of the switch(308) is simultaneously driven by a plurality of driving devices(driverA and driving circuit(B)(see figure 15).